



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/468,222	12/20/1999	DAVID ALLEN	002880.P001C	3372

7590 02/27/2003

JAMES H SALTER
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER	
LE, UYEN T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	7

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/468,222

Applicant(s)

ALLEN ET AL.

Examiner

Uyen T Le

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2171

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment to the abstract is acknowledged. Consequently, objection to the abstract is withdrawn.
2. Applicant's amendment to claim 2 is acknowledged. Consequently, objection to claim 2 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because claim 5, lines 2-3 "types of notes" is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2171

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (e) as being anticipated by Furusawa (US 5,805,152).

Regarding claim 1, Furusawa discloses all the claimed subject matter (see Figure 6, column 6, line 58- column 7, line 31). The claimed "user input device...an input text expression" is met by the data requesting means 22 and the request message. The claimed "parser to identify a keyword...with the keyword" is met when Furusawa shows that the system parses the received request message (see column 7, lines 16-19). The claimed "user output device...upon request" is met by data output means 27a and display unit 12.

5. Claims 1, 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (e) as being anticipated by Leong et al (US 5,996,010).

Regarding claim 1, Leong discloses all the claimed subject matter (see Figures 2, 3, 7, 8, column 6, line 12- column 7, line 5, column 8, line 58- column 12, line 55). The claimed "user input device...an input text expression" is met by the alpha-numeric input device shown in Figure 3. The claimed "parser to identify a keyword...with the keyword" is met when Furusawa shows that the system parses the received request line (see column 9, lines 4-8). The claimed "user output device...upon request" is met by the display shown in Figure 3.

Regarding claim 2, the claimed "object database...related to the information object" is met by the database of documents stored in item 54. The claimed "the user output device...user request" is met when Leong shows that the HTML document

Art Unit: 2171

displayed by the client also contains hyperlinks to managed objects (see column 13, lines 34-50).

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (e) as being anticipated by Register et al (US 5,371,807) of record.

Regarding claim 9, Register discloses all the claimed subject matter including receiving natural language text, parsing to identify keywords within the input text, identifying an information object associated with the keywords and associating the information object associated with the keyword with the input text (see the abstract, Figures 2, 3, 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leong et al (US 5,996,010), in view of Gladden (US 5,765,028).

Regarding claim 3, although Leong does not specifically show that the user input device is an email program, it is well known in the art as shown by Gladden to use an email program as an user input device to request information (see the abstract). Since the system of Leong processes input text expressions, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2171

one of ordinary skill in the art to include an email program as user input device as taught by Gladden in order to provide more options to enter the input text.

8. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leong et al (US 5,996,010).

Claims 5, 6 and 8 merely describe the keywords and information objects. Although Leong does not explicitly show such features, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include any keyword and any information objects in any database depending on user's requirements.

Claim 7 merely reads on the fact that the data related to the input text is located at the network device 32.

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leong et al (US 5,996,010), in view of Tso (US 6,085,201).

Regarding claim 4, although Leong does not explicitly show that the keywords are recognized based on context, it is well known in the art to recognize text based on context as shown by Tso (see the abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed feature in the system of Leong in order to accurately determine the input expression.

10. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Register et al (US 5,371,807) of record, in view of Tso (US 6,085,201).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 10, although Register does not explicitly show that the keywords are recognized based on context, it is well known in the art to recognize text based on context as shown by Tso (see the abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed feature in the system of Leong in order to accurately determine the input expression.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen T Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Uyen Le
February 23, 2003